

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated September 24, 2007. A Request for Continued Examination is filed herewith.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 19 and 37 have been clarified to specify a method of creating interactive print media, in accordance with the overall teaching of the specification. Claims 19 and 37 now also confirm that the memory storing the association is accessible via subsequent interactions with the print media – this accessibility together with the document information/identity data confers the requisite interactivity on the print media.

The Applicant maintains that a method of creating interactive print media, which comprises the essential step of ‘creating association data using data transmitted from a printer’ is not taught by the prior art. Accordingly, the Applicant maintains that the present invention is not obvious.

In his recent Office Action, the Examiner makes reference to Figure 1 and column 10, line 52 *et seq* of Dymetman in support of his assertion that Dymetman teaches the above-identified feature.

However, Figure 1 of Dymetman has nothing to do with the creation of interactive pages. Figure 1 is merely showing how a user can interact with one of Dymetman’s pages *after* it has been created. Figure 1 shows a pen interacting with a page, and column 10, line 52 *et seq* explains how this interaction is used to retrieve a digital page corresponding to the physical page with which the user interacts.

However, the user interaction shown in Figure 1 of Dymetman does not *create* association data in a computer system, which associates a page identity with document information printed on the page. Dymetman presupposes that such an association exists, but Dymetman is wholly silent on how such an association is created.

The present invention provides a system comprising a specially adapted printer with an optical sensor, which automatically reads a page identity from every page on which it prints and then transmits this identity to a computer system. The computer system, in turn, automatically associates this page identity with document information printed on the page and stores this association in a memory which is accessed whenever a user subsequently interacts with the page.

All that Dymetman teaches is accessing the association in a memory whenever a user interacts with a printed interactive page. There is nothing in Dymetman leading the skilled person to the presently claimed method of creating such interactive pages.

It is further submitted that the present invention is not obvious in view of Dymetman, Mori and Moscato.

Mori is concerned with a system for facile provision of reprints via a document ID code. The skilled person reading Dymetman, who wished to create Dymetman’s interactive pages, would not find anything of relevance in a document concerned with providing re-prints of

original documents. Likewise, the skilled person wishing to create Dymetman's interactive pages would find little of any relevance in Moscato, which is wholly concerned print verification. It has submitted that this combination of documents has been arrived at only with the benefit of hindsight.

Moreover, and as already argued by the Applicant, the combination of Mori and Moscato would a priori lead the skilled person to a somewhat farcical system and not one falling with the ambit of claims 19 or 37.

A priori, there was no motivation to use the sensor arrangement described by Moscato with Mori's re-printing system. The result of sensing *each* document printed (as taught by Moscato) would be farcical, because this would result in Mori endlessly generating copies of the same document.

In short, the Applicant submits that the Examiner has misinterpreted the teaching of Figure 1 in Dymetman and improperly combined this alleged teaching with Mori and Moscato. For at least these reasons, the Applicant maintains that the present invention is not obvious.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:

Kia S

Kia Silverbrook

S. Walmsley

Simon Robert Walmsley

P. Lapstun

Paul Lapstun

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762